



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

1/1/04

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,634	03/02/2004	Yasunori Azuma	450100-04961	3082
7590	04/05/2006		EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151			SAVLA, ARPAN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2185	
DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/791,634	AZUMA, YASUNORI
	Examiner Arpan P. Savla	Art Unit 2185

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The instant application having Application No. 10/791,634 has a total of 8 claims pending in the application, there are 2 independent claims and 6 dependent claims, all of which are ready for examination by Examiner.

INFORMATION CONCERNING OATH/DECLARATION

Oath/Declaration

1. Applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by Examiner and is found to conform to the requirements prescribed in 37 CFR 1.63.

STATUS OF CLAIM FOR PRIORITY IN THE APPLICATION

2. As required by MPEP § 201.14(c), acknowledgment is made of Applicant's claim for priority based on an application filed in the Japanese Patent Office on March 4, 2003.

INFORMATION CONCERNING DRAWINGS

Drawings

3. Applicant's drawings submitted March 2, 2004 are acceptable for examination purposes.

OBJECTIONS

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: "Method and Apparatus For Assigning Alias World Wide Node Names And Alias World Wide Port Names When Mounting or Moving Tape Drives Within A Tape Library."
5. On page 2, line 1 the phrase "drive consol" should read "drive console."
6. On page 4, line 7, the phrase "a FC drive" should read "an FC drive."

Claims

7. **Claims 4 and 8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.**
Claims 4 and 8 both recite the negative limitation "when each of the drives is not assigned the first address and the second address and a command causing the drive to be assigned the first address and the second address is not received from the host computer." Due to the negative limitation claim 4 lacks the limitation "the drives are assigned respective node IDs as first addresses and respective port IDs that represent mounted order numbers as second addresses" found in independent claim 1. Also, due to the negative limitation claim 8 lacks the limitation "assigning respective node IDs as

first addresses and respective port IDs that represent mounted order numbers as second addresses to a plurality of drives for recording and reproducing data to and from respective large capacity tape recording mediums" found in independent claim 5. Claims 4 and 8 are dependent on claims 1 and 5 respectively, however, claims 4 and 8 do not include every limitation of the claims from which they depend, thus, infringement of claims 4 and 8 would not infringe on claims 1 and 5 respectively. Therefore, claims 4 and 8 are improper dependent claims because they fail the "Infringement Test" as outlined in MPEP § 608.01(n), Section III.

REJECTIONS NOT BASED ON PRIOR ART

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the fourth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Subject to the following paragraph, a claim in dependent form shall contain a reference to a claim previously set forth and then specify a further limitation of the subject matter claimed. A claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which it refers.

9. **Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, fourth paragraph, as being improper dependent claims that fail the "Infringement Test."** Claims 4 and 8 both recite the negative limitation "when each of the drives is not assigned the first address and the second address and a command causing the drive to be assigned the first address and the second address is not received from the host computer." Due to the negative limitation claim 4 lacks the limitation "the drives are assigned respective node IDs as first addresses and respective port IDs that represent mounted order numbers as second addresses" found in independent claim 1. Also, due to the negative limitation

claim 8 lacks the limitation “assigning respective node IDs as first addresses and respective port IDs that represent mounted order numbers as second addresses to a plurality of drives for recording and reproducing data to and from respective large capacity tape recording mediums” found in independent claim 5. Claims 4 and 8 are dependent on claims 1 and 5 respectively, however, claims 4 and 8 do not include every limitation of the claims from which they depend, thus, infringement of claims 4 and 8 would **not** infringe on claims 1 and 5 respectively. Therefore, claims 4 and 8 are improper dependent claims because they fail the “Infringement Test” as outlined in MPEP § 608.01(n), Section III.

REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Goodman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,757,694) in view of Allen et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0161852).**

12. **As per claim 1**, Goodman discloses a tape library apparatus (col. 2, lines 5-7; Fig. 1) to which a node ID is assigned (col. 2, lines 46-48; Figs. 1 and 5, element 47)

and that is connected to a host computer (col. 2, line 33; Fig. 3, element 28), comprising:

a plurality of drives for recording and reproducing data to and from respective large capacity tape recording mediums, the drives having respective interfaces being capable of transferring large capacity data to the host computer (col. 2, lines 7-10, 25-28, and 32-35; Fig. 1, elements 12 and 14; Fig. 3, elements 28 and 29). *It should be noted that “reading/read from” is analogous to “reproducing”, “data storage media” is analogous “tape recording mediums”, and “host system” is analogous to “host computer.”*

the drives are assigned respective port IDs that represent mounted order numbers as second addresses (col. 3, lines 43-44; col. 4, lines 38-39) and the interfaces are activated (col. 2, 25-28 and 32-35; Fig. 3, element 29). *It should be noted that “drive position” is analogous to “mounted order number.” It should also be noted that it is inherently required the interface be activated in order for the host system to read and write data to and from the tape drives.*

Goodman does not expressly disclose the drives are assigned respective node IDs as first addresses.

Allen discloses the drives are assigned respective node IDs as first addresses and respective port IDs as second addresses (paragraph 0047, lines 7-8; Fig. 2, elements 255, 260, and 265). *It should be noted that “node_name” is analogous to “node ID” and “port_name” is analogous to “port ID.”*

Goodman and Allen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that being Fibre Channel systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement Allen's World Wide Name (WWN), which contains both a node ID and port ID, within Goodman's WWN, which is dependent on drive position.

The motivation for doing so would have been to gain the benefit of uniquely identifying and tracking devices connected to a Fibre Channel network through a SCSI bridge (Allen, paragraph 0027).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Goodman and Allen for the benefit of obtaining the invention as specified in claim 1.

13. As per claim 2, Goodman/Allen discloses when a new drive is mounted on the tape drive apparatus, the newly mounted drive is assigned the first address and the second address in accordance with a command received from the host computer (Goodman, col. 4, lines 39-42; col. 2, lines 28-32). *It should be noted that WWN assigned to the new drive is taken to be the combination of Goodman's WWN and Allen's WWN as established in the 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 1 above.*

14. As per claim 3, Goodman/Allen disclose when the mounted position of each of the drives is changed, the moved drive is assigned the first address and the second address in accordance with a command received from the host computer (Goodman, col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 6; col. 2, lines 28-32). *It should be noted that when a drive is moved its position in the library will change. However, since the WWN is based in part on drive position, the moved drive will be assigned a new WWN.*

15. As per claim 5, Goodman discloses a method of controlling a tape library apparatus to which a node ID is assigned (col. 2, lines 46-48; Figs. 1 and 5, element 47) and that is connected to a host computer (col. 2, line 33; Fig. 3, element 28), comprising the steps of:

assigning respective port IDs that represent mounted order numbers as second addresses to a plurality of drives (col. 3, lines 43-44; col. 4, lines 38-39) for recording and reproducing data to and from respective large capacity tape recording mediums (col. 2, lines 7-10, 25-28, and 32-35; Fig. 1, elements 12 and 14; Fig. 3, elements 28 and 29), the drives having respective interfaces being capable of transferring large capacity data to the host computer (col. 2, 25-28; Fig. 3, element 29),

and activating the interfaces (col. 2, 25-28 and 32-35; Fig. 3, element 29).

Please see citation notes for claim 1 above.

Goodman does not expressly disclose assigning respective node IDs as first addresses to a plurality of drives.

Allen discloses assigning respective node IDs as first addresses and respective port IDs as second addresses to a plurality of drives (paragraph 0047, lines 7-8; Fig. 2, elements 255, 260, and 265). *Please see the citation notes for claim 1 above.*

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement Allen's World Wide Name (WWN), which contains both a node ID and port ID, within Goodman's WWN, which is dependent on drive position.

The motivation for doing so would have been to gain the benefit of uniquely identifying and tracking devices connected to a Fibre Channel network through a SCSI bridge (Allen, paragraph 0027).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Goodman and Allen for the benefit of obtaining the invention as specified in claim 5.

16. **As per claim 6**, Goodman/Allen discloses when a new drive is mounted on the tape drive apparatus, assigning the newly mounted drive the first address and the second address in accordance with a command received from the host computer (Goodman, col. 4, lines 39-42; col. 2, lines 28-32). *Please see the citation note for claim 2 above.*

17. **As per claim 7**, Goodman/Allen discloses when the mounted position of each of the drives is changed, assigning the moved drive the first address and the second address in accordance with a command received from the host computer (Goodman, col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 6; col. 2, lines 28-32). *Please see the citation note for claim 3 above.*

18. **Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Goodman in view of Allen as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and in further view of Golasky et al. (U.S. Patent 6,880,101).**

19. Goodman/Allen discloses all of the limitations of claim 4 except when each of the drives is not assigned the first address and the second address and a command causing the drive to be assigned the first address and the second address is not

received from the host computer, an address that has been assigned to the drive upon production thereof is used.

Golasky discloses when each of the drives is not assigned the first address and the second address and a command causing the drive to be assigned the first address and the second address is not received from the host computer, an address that has been assigned to the drive upon production thereof is used (col. 5, lines 28-33). *It should be noted that "WWN" is analogous to "address that has been assigned to the drive upon production."*

Goodman/Allen and Golasky are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that being Fibre Channel systems.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement Golasky's WWN within Goodman/Allen's Fibre Channel system.

The motivation for doing so would have been to assign Fibre Channel devices with unique global IDs that identify the device's vendor and serial number, thus providing SAN management which includes compartmentalization, authorization, and securitization.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Goodman/Allen and Golasky for the benefit of obtaining the invention as specified in claim 4.

20. As per claim 8, Golasky discloses when each of the drives is not assigned the first address and the second address and a command causing the drive to be assigned the first address and the second address is not received from the host computer, using

an address that has been assigned to the drive upon production thereof (col. 5, lines 28-33). *Please see the citation note for claim 4 above.*

Conclusion

STATUS OF CLAIMS IN THE APPLICATION

The following is a summary of the treatment and status of all claims in the application as recommended by MPEP 707.70(i):

CLAIMS REJECTED IN THE APPLICATION

Per the instant office action, **claims 1-8** have received a first action on the merits and are subject of a first action non-final.

RELEVANT ART CITED BY THE EXAMINER

The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is cited to establish the level of skill in Applicant's art and those arts considered reasonably pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. See MPEP 707.05(e).

1. U.S. Patent 6,598,174 discloses a method and apparatus for storage unit replacement in non-redundant array.
2. U.S. Patent 6,779,083 discloses a security for logical units in storage subsystem.
3. U.S. Patent 6,877,042 discloses a system and method for generating World Wide Names (WWNs).
4. U.S. Patent 6,907,498 discloses a system and a method of assigning a storage device to a computer.

5. U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0129230 discloses a method, system, and program for determining system configuration information.
6. U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0131167 discloses a method for determining the node ID information of a second node device of a multi-node computer system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arpan P. Savla whose telephone number is (571) 272-1077. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Sparks can be reached on (571) 272-4201. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Arpan Savla
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2185
April 3, 2006



DONALD SPARKS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER